DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 316 472 SO 020 620

AUTHOR Hepburn, Mary A.
TITLE Educating for Democracy in the United States: The Postwar Years.
PUB DATE Sep 89
NOTE 16p.; Paper presented at the Conference on the Development of Democracy after World War II (Federal Republic of Germany, September 24-30, 1989).
AVAILABLE FROM Vinson Institute of Government, University of Georgia, Athens, GA 30602.
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Historical Materials (060)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Citizenship Education; *Civics; *Democracy; *Educational Change; Educational History; Elementary Secondary Education; Political Attitudes; Social Attitudes; *Social Change; *Social Influences; Social Studies
IDENTIFIERS Social Studies Curriculum; World War II

ABSTRACT

During the decade that followed World War II, social studies education in the United States was affected by many societal changes, particularly the new socio-political climate and a widespread discontent with the state of postwar public education. By the mid 1950s there was a crisis atmosphere regarding U.S. education contributed to by limited funds, rising enrollments, the need for a better educated industrial labor force, increasing criticism of curriculum content, and public fears of internal and external threats of communism. These factors gave rise to three major approaches to reform in social studies education each with a focus on education for democracy. One reform movement used a reactionary idea of citizenship based on fears of subversion. Supporters emphasized rote learning of democratic values and patriotism, and stressed nationalism in social studies courses. A second movement was based on a return to progressivism in social studies, using an interdisciplinary, problem-solving approach in the curriculum. A third movement sought to refocus education on so-called essentials, teaching the fundamental knowledge of history and social studies in a way that promoted democracy and created better informed citizens. A 22-item bibliography concludes the document. (AS) .pa

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED316472

EDUCATING FOR DEMOCRACY IN THE UNITED STATES: THE POSTWAR YEARS

Mary A. Hepburn
Vinson Institute of Government
University of Georgia

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

MARY A. HEPBURN

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SO 020 620

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EDUCATING FOR DEMOCRACY IN THE UNITED STATES: THE POSTWAR YEARS

Mary A. Hepburn
Vinson Institute of Government
University of Georgia

Historian Frederick Lewis Allen described the climate well. Concluding his book on the first 50 years of the 20th century in the U.S., he observed that there was an unrealistic fear of communism developing across the nation. He found a growing fear of change and the delusion that the nation was being overrun by Communists. Allen warned about such fear: "It causes well-meaning people to imagine that anyone with unorthodox ideas must be suspect of subversive intent. It tends to cramp men's imaginations into a timid conformity. It tends to constrict our generous impulses as people." The postwar national political climate that Allen described was an uneasy setting for educating young people to live in a democracy.

THE SOCIAL-POLITICAL CONTEXT IN THE POSTWAR DECADE

There was joy and celebration in the United States at the conclusion of the Second World War with the unconditional surrender of the Japanese in August, 1945. By early 1946 the U.S. had begun dismantling its vast military organization by discharging daily thousands of troops and cancelling industrial war contracts. The resulting oversupply of labor, decreases in production, and rising prices contributed to labor unrest and numerous strikes in the nation. Labor problems and inflation became the dominant domestic political issues of the late forties.

The bipartisan cooperation of wartime years dissolved as Republicans organized to raise objections to price controls, pro-labor policies, and high taxes that they complained were outcomes of Democratic President Harry Truman's "New Deal" policies. Conservatism was on the rise in the nation, and in 1946 Republicans won a majority in both houses of Congress for the first time since 1928. A strong labor control bill, the Taft-Hartley Act, was passed by Congress in 1947 over the veto of President Truman. The Republican Congress also legislated changes in the income tax that reduced the relative proportion of taxes on higher incomes.

President Truman and Congress often disagreed on solutions to domestic problems. But on questions of foreign policy and national security there was far greater accord. Problems with the Soviet Union had generated increasing hostility with the wartime ally. It took a great deal of pressure in 1946 to get the Soviets to withdraw from Iran, which they had jointly occupied with the British. The Soviets also had armies in Germany and throughout all of eastern Europe with the exception of Yugoslavia. In 1946 they were demanding

---

Prepared for presentation at the Conference on the Development of Democracy After World War II sponsored by the Bundeszentrale für Politische Bildung and the National Council for the Social Studies. September 24-30, 1989.

a portion of Turkey and partial control of the Dardanelles. When Winston Churchill visited the United States in 1946, he criticized the broad reach of Soviet forces from the Polish Baltic coast to Trieste on the Adriatic Sea as "an iron curtain" across Europe. He articulated the unfolding international "cold war" when he cautioned, "There is nothing they admire so much as strength, and there is nothing for which they have less respect than weakness, especially military weakness."

The U.S. president, state department, and Congress cooperated in developing a policy of containment, and for the first time the U.S. assumed a peacetime obligation to defend Western Europe. In March 1947, President Truman announced a program of financial aid to Greece and Turkey that became known as the Truman Doctrine. It was designed to help these two nations resist aggression from "totalitarian regimes." In April, 1948, Congress passed the European Recovery Act, which initiated a plan for massive economic assistance designed by Secretary of State George C. Marshall. Sixteen western European countries received 12 1/2 billion dollars in aid to help revitalize their economies and resist advances of communism from within and without.

By 1949 concerns about the Soviets in Germany had not only generated further cooperative executive-congressional action for "containment" but had also strengthened the American commitment to military cooperation with western European countries through the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. NATO had twelve members in 1949 and by 1954 there were 15 members including West Germany. NATO countries agreed to joint action if any member nation was attacked by the Soviet Union. Although by the early 1950s the U.S. had made great strides toward military containment of Soviet communism in Europe, historian Eric Goldman (1956, 97) perceived that "for most Americans, Communism as a world force, far from being contained, seemed a much greater, a much more insidious menace than ever before."

The situation in Asia stimulated American apprehensiveness. Although the Nationalist government led by General Chiang Kai-shek had been given official recognition by all of the allies at the end of the war, Chinese Communists in northern China had a large army, and they were gaining support from the masses of Chinese people. The U.S. had tried to assist Chiang throughout the forties, even to the point of establishing a coalition government with the communists. But in 1949 as Mao's communist forces moved south from Manchuria taking over large portions of the mainland, Chiang's government fled to the island of Taiwan. The Soviet Union then gave diplomatic recognition to Mao's government. Americans had been relieved to sense less danger from communism in Europe with the end of the Berlin blockade and the formation of NATO. Then the cold War broke out in Asia. The shocked American public learned that communists in China now controlled nearly one fourth of the earth's surface and more than a fourth of its people.

Another blow to American confidence about the containment of communism came in the autumn of 1949 when the president's office announced that it had evidence of an atomic test explosion in the U.S.S.R. One Nobel prize atomic researcher was quoted as saying, "There is only one thing worse than one nation having the atomic bomb -- that's two nations having it" (Goldman, 100). And so, as the fear of international communism grew, the American people

became increasingly apprehensive of possible subversives in their own society and increasingly vulnerable to irresponsible accusations.

One politician took the leadership in voicing dangers of internal communism and spearheaded the anti-communist reaction. Joseph McCarthy, Republican Senator from Wisconsin, intensified the fears of communist subversion and became a symbol of its chronic paranoia. He gained national press coverage in 1950 when he charged in a public address that at least 57 people working in the U.S. Department of State were communists. Subsequently, he made similar charges about people in various agencies of government, claiming the Truman administration was riddled with subversives. McCarthy, however, offered little or no evidence to substantiate his charges, and as a member of the Senate speaking in Senate committee hearings he had immunity from lawsuits for slander. He got wide press coverage, and much of the public responded with readiness to believe his wild charges of continuing communist espionage. Although there had been some cases of Soviet espionage involving American communists, the number of such cases was few.

(The widespread fear of internal communism in this period is likely to be an enigma to our European colleagues considering that 1) the Communist Party had no real success in the U.S. as a national party and 2) the limited following that communism had in the early forties had declined.)

For nearly five years Senator McCarthy captured news headlines by making public accusations that there were communists in the U.S. government. When General Douglas McArthur was relieved of his post in Asia in 1951 for failing to follow orders and attempting to expand the war in Korea to China, he returned to the U.S. and added fuel to the fire by expounding a theory of conspiracy to explain events in Asia. McCarthy capitalized on the frustrations of the public over the stalemate in Korea and broadened his attacks to accuse university scholars, writers, and many other intellectuals. Some considered his attacks to be aimed at the upper class, the privileged, the intellectuals, the purveyors of social and political change (See Lipset, 1955). However, other analysts of the period view McCarthy's attacks as a vendetta "against all departures from tradition in foreign policy, against the new, the adventurous, the questing in any field" (Goldman, 1956, 213).

A 1954 national Gallup Poll indicated that 50% of American adults held a "favorable opinion" of McCarthy, and only 29% had an "unfavorable" opinion of him (Baker, 43). As one commentator later stated, "few remembered or seemed to care that it was not against the law to be a communist, much less to have been one in the past" (Bazelon, 1964).

Another factor in the subversive paranoia, particularly in the South, was the 1954 Supreme Court decision in Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka which found that separate education facilities for blacks were "inherently unequal." The decision shocked most white southern leaders and met with stiff opposition for years. Some white leaders viewed the Supreme Court's decision as proof that there was communism in government. The court decision and white resistance in the deep south incited the massive civil rights movement of the mid-fifties that continued through the 60s and 70s.

After General Dwight Eisenhower became president in 1953, McCarthy and his allies could not attack the executive branch of government as tainted by the "New Deal." Nevertheless, he continued his charges even against his own political party's administration. In Senate committee hearings that were televised for 36 days in 1954, he focused his attack on the leadership in the U.S. Army. Television apparently contributed to McCarthy's demise. He was particularly reckless in his accusations against the military, even implying that President Eisenhower was allowing treasonous acts in the Army. During the hearings, U.S. Army attorneys revealed that McCarthy had sought special treatment in the Army for a former member of his staff. Television coverage further revealed McCarthy's loud, bullying behavior in contrast to the dignity and reason of the Army's attorneys.

Ultimately he lost both public support and the backing of the right wing of the Republican Party. In December, 1954, his Senate colleagues passed a resolution of condemnation of him by a vote of 67-22. McCarthy and the public paranoia he helped to create presented a grave challenge to the basic freedoms in a democracy and stirred controversy about how to educate youth for democratic citizenship.

THE EDUCATIONAL CONTEXT

In the 1940s the theoretical framework and terminology generally found in exchanges of professional educators had evolved from several decades of the progressive education movement. It was progressivism modified to practical, personal concerns. The modified progressivism in the post war years is especially evident in the publications of the Educational Policy Commission of the National Education Association (1944, 1952), Education for All American Youth. These books offered recommendations and examples of how schools across the nation could meet the needs of young people from all social/economic levels. Throughout discussions of both urban and rural school programs, the commission reiterated three purposes for American education: 1) personal development, 2) vocational preparation, and 3) civic responsibility and competence. The 1944 volume shows a heavy concern for the development of "the individual" in the elementary school, and for guidance counseling in secondary schools to assist students in selecting careers, finding jobs, and attaining personal satisfaction.

The 1944 yearbook of the National Council for the Social Studies (Krug and Anderson, 1944) is an example of widespread solicitude toward "individual differences," "emotional factors," and "life adjustment" in education. One chapter acclaims a high school social studies program sensitive to student differences that utilized daily double periods to study "youth problems without reference to subject-matter boundaries." The teacher describes how she determined student differences by checking personal data and home life, reviewing test scores, watching for differences in attitudes and behaviors in the classroom, and observing "emotional factors." The students selected a "youth problem" to study (such as vocations, recreation, health, or personal problems that lead to crime). They organized into committees to study various aspects of the youth problem using a variety of activities including drama, community activities, and group discussions. Objectives of the approach were

to help individual students gain social approval of the group and develop "life skills" so that they would be better able to deal with their personal problems and, ultimately, societal problems as well.

"Life adjustment," "individual differences," "teaching children not subjects," and "adjusting the school to the child" were the educational catch-phrases of the times. A number of the original proponents of progressivism, including John Dewey, were disenchanted with the forties fixation on these bits and pieces from progressive education. The term "life adjustment" created particular problems because it seemed to imply that students should adjust to conditions around them, thus encouraging mediocrity. As educational historian Lawrence Cremin (1963) assessed the situation, the progressive education movement had lost its intellectual vitality and had failed to keep pace with changes in American society and its broader national needs.

In the early fifties criticism of education and educators was increasing. By the mid-fifties it had become widespread. Limited funds for new school buildings, rising enrollments as war babies entered elementary schools, industry's call for a better educated labor force, accelerating criticism of the shallowness of curriculum content by essentialist intellectuals, and public apprehensiveness over internal and external threats of communism -- all contributed to a crisis atmosphere regarding education.

VOICES FOR REFORM IN THE SOCIAL STUDIES

Social studies is especially sensitive to changes in the societal context as well as changes in the education profession. To assess the tenor of social studies education in the postwar era and determine how its professionals responded to change in the decade, I have turned to several key books calling for reform, yearbooks of the National Council for the Social Studies, and selected articles in social studies journals.

The social-political climate and widespread discontent with education gave rise to three differing approaches to reform in social studies education. One was to systematically inculcate democratic values and teach citizenship with a patriotic fervor in hopes of defeating communism. Another was to revitalize Deweyan ideas of democratic education utilizing interdisciplinary studies that would focus the curriculum on society's problems. A third approach was a return to teaching the basic disciplines of history and social sciences in the curriculum. A broad sampling of the postwar literature on social studies education revealed persuasive proponents of each of these approaches.

1. CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION TO WARD OFF COMMUNISM

Many political and educational leaders were convinced that the schools had to educate for "a divided world," and that meant a special civic education that would impart the love of democracy while preventing the spread of communism in the U.S. and abroad. As one agitated professor wrote in the journal The Social Studies (Keohane, 1951), "What we must insist upon is that our young people be educated to maintain the Western heritage of freedom and

to improve and spread it while simultaneously they prepare themselves physically, intellectually, and morally to defend it in whatever ways may be necessary." He warned that the U.S. should not accept the idea of "one world" and thereby "surrender to the totalitarian fanatics and cynical careerists of the Kremlin."

Extremist critics of education argued that progressive pedagogy and rising school taxes were linked with leftism and subversive plots that would lead to communist takeover of the United States. There were demands for patriotic assemblies in the schools and more "Americanism" in the civic education curriculum. Some educators sought to calm public fears by intensifying civic education with classroom recitation of the traits of a "good citizen." Admonishing students in an authoritative manner, they sought to imbue them with democratic values. A 1951 article in Social Education (Karsch, 1951) remarked on the promptness with which schools and colleges, in response to the "threat of totalitarianism," adjusted their curricula and guidance programs to add more social studies, particularly American history and government.

It is evident that the cold war and public fear of communism were on the minds of the members of the Educational Policies Commission of NEA in 1952. To avoid having Americans "succumb" to communist ideology, it proposed that the schools must foster loyalty in both teachers and students. American schools were described as "a bulwark against the danger of disloyalty," and the teaching of loyalty was presented as one means to building feelings of nationalism and "civic competence." Assuming that many young men would be called into military service, the commission urged that American values be taught well, not only because these young men would protect the nation "in both war and peace," but also because people of other countries judge the U.S. by its military forces abroad. The commission even considered the need to inculcate American values in young women, stating that "the struggle between democracy and totalitarianism involves active responsibilities for women."

Numerous lists were prepared for citizenship education, apparently partly to assure the public and partly to assure the profession that democratic citizenship was being protected. For example, the 22nd NCSS yearbook (Carey, 1951) reported advances in citizenship education on all fronts -- the school curriculum, in colleges, in teacher education and in curriculum projects. Among the lists were an appendix listing 135 behaviors and modes of thinking that characterized a good citizen, a list of journal articles on the topic, and a report of 1700 organizations in the U.S. that were interested in citizenship education.

A publication of the American Association of School Administrators (1954), Educating for American Citizenship, viewed the cold war as a "total threat." They perceived the nation to be in an internal and international struggle over values with "imperialist Russian communism." This total threat required special attention to citizenship education, which was vested with important new responsibilities to teach and defend the ideals of American society and to produce strong-minded Americans devoted to democracy. Although the volume encourages standard social studies approaches to citizenship education such as teaching concentric communities and problem solving skills

related to civic problems, teachers were reminded that stability and loyalty are primary attributes of good citizenship along with intelligence and vision.

The climate for education had become so oppressive with censorship and accusations that many teachers feared to teach. These pressures reached such alarming proportions that the Committee on Academic Freedom of NCSS (1956) was prompted to "oppose aggressively investigations that damage individual reputations and lower the morale of our teachers." The published position statement made a professional commitment to national loyalty and delineated preventative measures as well as legal and professional actions in cases of unjustified attacks on teacher loyalty.

2. REVITALIZING THE INTERDISCIPLINARY SOCIAL PROBLEMS APPROACH

For a number of social studies educators the oppressive atmosphere of the McCarthy years increased their conviction that teaching critical thinking skills was fundamental in a democracy. They argued that a clear distinction must be made between indoctrination, the authoritarian method of social studies education, and reflective thinking, the democratic method. As one NCSS yearbook editor stated it, the task of social studies teachers is made "more vital and more difficult because of the struggle between freedom and slavery which is now going on" (Allen, 1952).

A yearbook designed to assist teachers and administrators in revising the social studies curriculum revealed the direction of change. The editors (Ellsworth and Sand, 1955) stated that "the frontiers of our present world are largely in the realm of the social sciences." Throughout the 1950s this professional movement sought to revitalize the instructional concepts of scientific method, reflective thinking, and interdisciplinary application of social sciences and history. Theoretical groundings were provided by teacher education books written in the mid-fifties.

One of the books, Teaching High School Social Studies: Problems in Reflective Thinking, (Hunt and Metcalf, 1955) was written, quite remarkably, during the peak of the accusations of communism and leftism in the schools. The authors stated directly that uncritical transmission of culture was inappropriate for educating democratic citizens. They argued that a democratic society requires citizens who can and will think critically about all issues -- even those social and political issues that are considered "taboo" in the schools. This requirement places a responsibility on the teacher to teach careful scientific thinking, the analyses of evidence and implications. Hunt and Metcalf's theoretical framework, based on John Dewey's works, proposes combining content and method of social sciences and history in application to important problems of the society. While the social sciences expand the frontier of reliable knowledge, it was envisioned that school social studies must teach students how to utilize that knowledge in making informed decisions on society's problems.

Hunt and Metcalf also considered classroom climate and teaching style to be significant contributing factors to social studies education. Here they drew from Lewinian field theory and research. The authors viewed learning in the associationist tradition as suited only to totalitarian nations; in a

democratic society open inquiry in a cooperative setting is needed. Thus reflective thinking, although it relies on a given authority or framework, is ever critical and can challenge that authority in the process of seeking new knowledge.

Acknowledging that traditional social studies subjects, especially history, give people common knowledge and values, they insisted that for democratic values to be understood, learning must be much more than memorizing and recounting. The content must include the "closed areas" or problem areas of American culture that often are characterized by public irrationality and dispute. Among the societal issues they discussed were: social class, race and minority group relations, nationalism and patriotism, and power and law. It was their purpose to open these "closed areas," the issues of great controversy in the society, to study and discussion in the schools and as a result to open "closed minds" to reflection and critical analysis. This they felt was the appropriate social studies education for a democratic society.

Another seminal work on the problem solving approach in social studies in this postwar era was a book by Earl S. Johnson, Theory and Practice of the Social Studies (1956). His thesis was that the main purpose of education in a democracy is the development of democratic character, a character of "goodness" and "wisdom." Johnson, who was a professor of social sciences at the University of Chicago, was trained in sociology and considered a sociological approach helpful for organizing a social studies curriculum for a democratic society. He noted that political, economic and social problems do not fit "into watertight compartments." Wrote Johnson, "No single body of subject matter based on any one of the single disciplines can give the student his world." Therefore, knowledge of social science subjects must be synthesized to address matters of the modern society. The synthesis of separate subject matters would provide the means to study "what is general, common, repetitive, and pervasive in human experience."

Like Hunt and Metcalf he was convinced that in the education of teachers the content of social studies could not be separated from the methods of instruction, and throughout the book he discussed them jointly. Likewise, he was concerned about classroom climate and called for a "therapeutic" learning environment in the social studies classroom. Every classroom should be viewed as a social system in which students can be assisted in developing skills, esteem and internal discipline. Johnson defended original progressive ideas of educating for democracy, arguing that the real spirit of Dewey's rationale, based on internal discipline, had been lost through overemphasis on Rousseauean notions of free development.

Johnson described his overall approach as the "social process approach," taking into account needs of individuals "engaged in self-maintenance" and needs of the society "engaged in the maintenance of a social order." Throughout his book, he is committed not only to educating for wisdom and moral responsibility in the character of individuals, but also to the closely related objective of a humane and rational society wherein there is a "critical loyalty" to democracy.

3. A CALL FOR TEACHING THE ESSENTIALS

American intellectuals other than professional educators had become increasingly vocal in their criticism of the soundness and substance of education in the nation's public schools. Among the academicians who wrote about the deficiencies of the schools and curriculum were Robert Hutchins, Paul Woodring, and Arthur Bestor. Bestor was, by far, the most effective voice calling for a return to the teaching of the essentials of the disciplines of knowledge. Bestor, professor of American history at the University of Illinois, wrote two books and at least 30 magazine and journal articles criticizing American education throughout the 1950s. He was able to galvanize the discontent with the schools among American intellectuals and, ultimately, with the larger reading public. His numerous writings provided a probing, persistent, thoughtful evaluation of American education.

According to Bestor (1952) public fears of communist infiltration in the schools were misguided. Rather, American education was being subverted by a lack of intellectual vigor and "a vanishing sense of purpose." He decried the amorphous goals of "life adjustment" and "vocationalism" that he found in American education in the early fifties. As Bestor saw it, the original principles and practices of Deweyan progressivism had been watered down. School subjects had become overly concerned with the personal problems of adolescents, neglecting their intellectual development.

Education for democracy, he argued, must not be viewed as different from education in the essentials. Democracy could best be protected by providing for all youths a basic education in history, sciences, English, mathematics, and foreign language -- the education that once had been available only to an elite. While not denying the need for student awareness of current public problems and civic affairs, Bestor insisted that the schools in a democracy must first aim for high intellectual competence and basic knowledge so that the public will be able to deal intelligently with public and personal problems.

Bestor assailed a trio of pedagogic professional groups -- state departments of education personnel, school administrators, and faculties of colleges of education. Referring to them as "educationists" who formed an "interlocking directorate," he accused them of establishing and reinforcing standards for teacher education that heavily emphasized pedagogical methods and were very weak on content. They claim to have exclusive concern for good teaching, he said. Yet, they failed to encourage scholarship and critical thinking in the subjects the teachers were training to teach. As a result, Bestor found, anti-intellectualism had become the modus vivendi in the schools. Teachers had become so concerned about engaging student interest, they were failing to systematically teach substance, the academic disciplines.

As a history professor, Bestor took special interest in social studies. He abhorred the terms "social studies" and "social education," however, and claimed that use of them contributed to confusion, vagueness, and failure to teach the social sciences and history with any rigor.

In Bestor's analogy (1955) history has about the same relationship to the social sciences that mathematics has to the natural sciences, providing them with powerful tools. Thus, he viewed history as an "indispensable complement" to the social sciences balancing their contemporary focus with an examination of the past. He warned, however, that history must retain its separate identity in schools and its special perspectives and skills must be taught. Likewise, he was concerned that historians in the American Historical Association were not communicating directly with teachers but were dealing with school curriculum and teacher education questions through the National Council for the Social Studies, which, he claimed, neither protected the systematic teaching of history nor the teaching of the disciplines of political science or economics.

Bestor attacked the broad personal social goals found in guidelines for social studies teachers. He singled out a book prepared for Illinois teachers, The Schools and National Security, which in a section on teaching about WWII recommended that students study how dating patterns were affected by the war. He was equally negative about the ways in which social studies educators went about "educating for a changing world." He supported the objective but criticized the heavy focus on current affairs as shallow and in need of historical perspective.

Overall, Bestor's writings criticized social studies in the fifties as a subject that had become a muddle of the disciplines of history and social sciences, taught with excessive emphasis on contemporary problems, and trivialized by concerns for personal life adjustment -- a result of progressive education gone awry. To reform the social studies, Bestor recommended that the disciplines of history and the social sciences be taught to sharpen powers of systematic thought. Only in these academic contexts could contemporary issues of democracy be fruitfully examined.

SUMMARY

In the postwar decade the interest in integrating personal/social "life adjustment" into the social studies gradually declined, especially in secondary education. In the late 1940s and through the mid 1950s, statements of the mission of social studies education shifted toward broader societal and international goals. Economic and political concerns of the postwar era, particularly the "cold war" with international communism and internal conflicts over national loyalty led to the development of a number of interest groups with differing ideas about how public education must be reformed to better serve a democratic society. Several interpretations of the needs of a democratic nation and how to meet those needs are found in the social studies literature.

One movement for change in the social studies developed as educators recoiled from accusations based on fears of national and international leftism. This group reverted to a reactionary notion of citizenship. The emphasis was on rote learning of civic duties and values and an uncritical commitment to lists of democratic precepts. Interest groups pressured school systems to assure that patriotism was in the curriculum. The prevalent

secondary course structure was: 7th grade - geography and state history, 8th grade - American history, 9th grade - civics, 10th grade - world history, 11th grade - American history, and 12th grade - problems of democracy. These reformers did not require that the traditional course structure be changed. Rather, they wanted nationalism to be stressed in existing courses. Censorship, accusations of disloyalty, and public pressures became so troublesome to teachers that state and national organizations of social studies teachers formed committees to resist irrational interference.

A second social studies reform movement developed as an effort to bring back and strengthen earlier forms of progressivism in social studies by assuring that current, national controversies be included in the curriculum. Its proponents called for social studies curriculum and instruction that would educate students for reflective, critical analysis about the important societal issues of the time. This approach to education for democracy apparently received its strongest support from teacher educators. However, except for 12th grade, it did not fit the prevailing course structure and would require significant changes in the secondary curriculum. Other obstacles to adoption of the problem solving approach included teacher hesitancy to raise controversial issues and their lack of experience and training in methods of controversial issue analysis. In addition, it may have been difficult for the public to distinguish the personal problems objectives, so heavily criticized by the intellectual community, from the broader societal problem solving objectives introduced by Hunt and Metcalf, Johnson, and others.

The third movement arose as a demand that education be refocused on the essentials of knowledge. The university professors who spearheaded the movement sought to shuck away the "pseudo-progressivism" that had seeped into the social studies. They claimed that the American democracy would benefit from education in the fundamental knowledge of history and the social sciences; that students would become better informed citizens if they studied the substance of history and social science, rather than participating in "life-adjustment" projects. One strength of their movement was that their recommendations would readily fit the existing structure of courses in the social studies curriculum. Also it is likely that the public could make sense of these proposed reforms since history had been the heart of the curriculum for many years.

Clearly Americans were not satisfied with the effectiveness of public education in the U.S. in the postwar era, and, of course, that included social studies education. The reform of curriculum and instruction in social studies had been proposed, argued, and reargued for most of the 1950s. However, it was not until the late fifties that action for change was triggered. It took an international event to produce the public interest, competitive spirit, political impetus, and economic support needed to reform education. A tiny, beeping satellite, "Sputnik," revealed that the U.S.S.R. had the technological knowledge and skills to supersede the U.S. in space. Then, the national desire to reform education became near hysteria. It seemed that the academic critics had been correct, American education must have become weak. Greater rigor and greater emphasis on the disciplines of knowledge must be needed. Bestor and his followers had the greatest impact on public opinion, creating a

critical atmosphere that was sparked into a storm of change by the Soviet launching of Sputnik in 1957. But the elevation of science and social science in the curriculum concepts developed by Hunt and Metcalf and Johnson were to have an influence also.

Ehlers and Lee (1955, 1959), recalling difficulties they had in the early fifties preparing a teacher education book that dealt openly with issues of censorship and loyalty, exalted the return in the late fifties of an open climate in education: "In a democratic society education has a unique place and quality. For democracy is not so much rule by majority, as a method of attaining majority through education, information and free communication. Unlike dictatorial forms of government, democracy has everything to gain and nothing to lose from the intelligence of its citizens" (1). In a more democratic atmosphere professionals, academicians, and public leaders were regrouping to improve education in history and the social sciences, heralding the beginnings of "the New Social Studies."

REFERENCES

Allen, Frederick Lewis. 1952. THE BIG CHANGE. New York: Bantam Books.

Allen, Jack (ed.). 1952. THE TEACHER OF THE SOCIAL STUDIES. Washington, D.C.: National Council of the Social Studies, 23rd Yearbook.

American Association of School Administrators. 1954. EDUCATING FOR AMERICAN CITIZENSHIP. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.

Baker, Gary G. 1970. COMMUNISM IN AMERICA: LIBERTY AND SECURITY IN CONFLICT. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley.

Bazelon, David T. 1964. Introduction to "Point of Order! A Documentary of the Army-McCarthy Hearings" quoted in G.G. Baker, COMMUNISM IN AMERICA.

Bestor, Arthur. 1952. EDUCATIONAL WASTELANDS: THE RETREAT FROM LEARNING IN OUR PUBLIC SCHOOLS. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Bestor, Arthur. 1955. THE RESTORATION OF LEARNING. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Carey, R.W. (ed.). 1951. EDUCATION FOR DEMOCRATIC CITIZENSHIP. Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 22nd Yearbook.

Committee on Academic Freedom of NCSS. 1956. "Action to Uphold Freedom to Learn and Freedom to Teach" in SOCIAL EDUCATION, Vol. 20, No. 8 (Dec.), p. 371 - 374.

Cremin, Lawrence A. 1961. THE TRANSFORMATION OF THE SCHOOL. New York: Vintage Books.

Educational Policies Commission of the National Education Association and American Association of School Administrators. 1944. EDUCATION FOR ALL AMERICAN YOUTH. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.

Educational Policies Commission of the National Education Association and American Association of School Administrators. 1952. EDUCATION FOR ALL AMERICAN YOUTH: A FURTHER LOOK. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.

Ehlers, Henry and Lee, Gordon C. (eds.). 1955, 1959. CRUCIAL ISSUES IN EDUCATION. New York: Henry Holt and Co.

Ellsworth, Ruth and Sand, Ole (co-editors). 1955. IMPROVING THE SOCIAL STUDIES CURRICULUM. Twenty-sixth Yearbook of the National Council for the Social Studies. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.

Goldman, Eric F. 1956. THE CRUCIAL DECADE. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Hunt, Maurice and Metcalf, Lawrence E. 1955. TEACHING HIGH SCHOOL SOCIAL STUDIES: PROBLEMS IN REFLECTIVE THINKING. New York: Harper and Row.

Johnson, Earl S. 1956. THEORY AND PRACTICE OF THE SOCIAL STUDIES. New York: MacMillan.

Karsch, Robert F. 1951. "The Teaching of American Government" in SOCIAL EDUCATION, Vol. 15, No. 1 (Jan.), pp. 16 - 20.

Keohane, Robert E. 1951. "Educating for Civic Leadership" in THE SOCIAL STUDIES, Vol. 42, No. 3 (March), p. 99 - 104.

Krug, Edward and Anderson, G.L. 1944. ADOPTING INSTRUCTION IN THE SOCIAL STUDIES TO INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES. Washington, D.C.: National Council for Social Studies.

Lipset, Seymour Martin. 1963. "The Sources of Radical Right - 1955" in THE RADICAL RIGHT (Daniel Bell, ed.) New York: Doubleday.

Rovere, Richard H. 1959. SENATOR JOE McCARTHY. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.